**Appendix 4: BMW Development and Horspath Sports Park - Equalities Impact Assessment**



**Form to be used for the Full Equalities Impact Assessment**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Service Area:** | Community Services | | **Section:** Active Communities | | | **Date of Initial assessment:**  29.07.15 | | **Key Person responsible for assessment:**  Ian Brooke – Head of Service | | **Date assessment commenced:**  29.07.15 | | |
| **Name of Policy to be assessed:** | | | | | | New Proposal: BMW Development and Horspath Sports Park | | | | | | |
| **1. In what area are there concerns that the policy could have a differential impact** | | | | | | ***Race***  None | ***Disability***  None | | | | ***Age***  None | |
| ***Gender***  None | ***Religion or Belief***  None | | | | ***Sexual Orientation***  None | |
| **Other strategic/ equalities considerations** | | | | | | ***Safeguarding/ Welfare of Children and vulnerable adults***  None | ***Mental Wellbeing/ Community Resilience***  None | | | | ***Marriage & Civil Partnership***  None | |
| **2. Background:**  Give the background information to the policy and the perceived problems with the policy which are the reason for the Impact Assessment. | | | | | | MINI Plant Oxford has a long standing ambition to increase their capacity by increasing the size of the Cowley plant. By doing this, they are far more likely to remain in the city, which has significant economic benefits.  To increase capacity, BMW want to extend the plant into the sports fields that are currently leased by the Oxford Sport and Social Club (previously known as the Rover Sport and Social Club). When the Social Club’s lease expires in 2016, the Social Club will dissolve as MINI Plant Oxford will cease subsidising the Social Club.  To develop on sports fields, Sport England and our planning policy dictates that BMW would need to re-provide the sports pitches and ancillary facilities. The need for the pitches is identified in the City’s Playing Pitch Strategy (2013-2016).  The core project deliverables consist of:  4 x Senior Football Pitches  2 x Youth football pitches  3 x Junior football pitches  1 x Goalkeeper training area  3 x cricket pitches  1 x Main building  1 x Cricket pavilion  1 x Academy Building  1 x Full sized 3G AGP  6 x Small sided 3G AGP | | | | | | |
| **3. Methodology and Sources of Data**:  The methods used to collect data and what sources of data | | | | | | METHODOLOGY:Project Approach Ahead of any construction works, a detailed project delivery plan including full feasibility work must be undertaken. This will include all site and project specific surveys.  The construction project will need to be split into 3 phases.   * Construction of stadium/show pitch * Construction of ancillary facilities (changing rooms, car parking, utilities) * Construction of sports pitches  ICT Requirement Installation of main servers as per key user requirements Procurement Route It is likely that the procurement route will need to be tailored for specific elements of the construction. Project Options Project delivery options include –   * External funding via NGB’s to increase scope * External funding via corporate partners * Internal vs external project management * Differing lease agreement options as identified in the feasibility report. | | | | | | |
| **4. Consultation**  This section should outline all the consultation that has taken place on the EIA. It should include the following.  • Why you carried out the consultation.  • Details about how you went about it.  • A summary of the replies you received from people you consulted.  • An assessment of your proposed policy (or policy options) in the light of the responses you received.  • A statement of what you plan to do next | | | | | | The Council undertook a soft market testing exercise to understand the appetite of the market with regard to working in partnership to develop and operate a high-quality offer. The purpose of the exercise was to enable the Council to develop a deliverable procurement approach that combines commercial interest and an attractive proposal for potential bidders with the long-term needs of the Council, sporting users of the existing site and residents of Oxford. The soft market test allowed interested organisations with appropriate experience to outline their initial views and provide information with no commitment to themselves or the Council.The Council used the results of this exercise to help shape its decision making process with respect to delivery and the future management of this new facility and options to undertake any form of competitive process. The Council was not however tied to any of the proposals or suggestions the market may have provided. A feasibility study and options appraisal was conducted in the second half of 2014 to undertake a needs assessment for the replacement facilities. An outline business was also developed to consider the operating position of the various options.  The relocation proposals do not seek to re-provide the social facilities that currently exist. The users of the social facilities have been aware that these facilities will be closing for some time. | | | | | | |
| **5. Assessment of Impact:**  Provide details of the assessment of the policy on the six primary equality strands. There may have been other groups or individuals that you considered. Please also consider whether the policy, strategy or spending decisions could have an impact on safeguarding and / or the welfare of children and vulnerable adults | | | | | | Officers consider that there is no adverse impact on safeguarding and / or the welfare of children and vulnerable adults with their recommendation.  The new development would present a positive impact not only re-providing the football and cricket provision, but would also enable a new artificial grass pitch to be developed. This would protect current usage and the new astro turf would enable a positive increase in usage. Constraints *Key constraints include –*   * *Planning* * *Funding* * *Statutory land agreements* * *Existing users* * *Timescales* * *NGB requirements – EPPP for football*   It is anticipated that many of the existing users of the sports facilities would be retained and would continue to use the replacement facilities, under usage agreements or lease arrangements as yet not identified or agreed.  In conjunction with exploring the technical feasibility of the relocation proposals, options appraisal has also included a review of the future sustainability and viability of the relocation site. | | | | | | |
| **6. Consideration of Measures**:  This section should explain in detail all the consideration of alternative approaches/mitigation of adverse impact of the policy | | | | | | The current sports provision is managed by The Oxford Sport and Social Club (previously known as the Rover Sport and Social Club). Their lease ends in March 2016. The Sport and Social Club do not wish to manage the new sports site and will cease operating when their lease ends. This could result in that BMW locking up the site and the facilities would no longer be in use.  The main user of the sports facilities is Oxford United, who use the site as their training facility. The club also has a classroom and gym on site that need to be re provided. Losing this provision would impact the clubs ability to compete at their current level. | | | | | | |
| **6a. Monitoring Arrangements:**  Outline systems which will be put in place to monitor for adverse impact in the future and this should include all relevant timetables. In addition it could include a summary and assessment of your monitoring, making clear whether you found any evidence of discrimination. | | | | | | * CorVu periodic reporting against key performance indicators * Project Board support (i.e. Leisure Delivery Board) * Service Management Team periodic key agenda item * Sport England Active people Survey | | | | | | |
| **7. 12. Date reported and signed off by City Executive Board:** | | | | | | 10 September 2015 | | | | | | |
| **8. Conclusions**:  What are your conclusions drawn from the results in terms of the policy impact | | | | | | * Reduced financial burden of site * Increased provision of sporting facilities with community access * Increased links with existing sports clubs and OCC * Replacement sports pitches and ancillary facilities. * A positive impact on participation in sport and sports development | | | | | | |
| **9. Are there implications for the Service Plans?** | | YES | | ~~NO~~ | **10. Date the Service Plans will be updated** | | | | March/ April 2016 | | **11. Date copy sent to Equalities Officer in HR & Facilities** | 27.07.15 |
| .**13. Date reported to Scrutiny and Executive Board:** | | N/A | | N/A | **14. Date reported to City Executive Board:** | | | | 10.09.15 | | **12. The date the report on EqIA will be published** | TBC |

Signed (completing officer) Lucy Cherry – Leisure & Performance Manager

Signed (Lead Officer) Ian Brooke – Head of Service

**Please list the team members and service areas that were involved in this process:**

Organisational Development & Learning Advisor/ Equalities: (completing officer) Jarlath Brine.